FILED

NFC 17 2012

Board of Vocational Nursing and Psychiatric Technicians

1 KAMALA D. HARRIS Attorney General of California 2 LINDA K. SCHNEIDER Supervising Deputy Attorney General 3 State Bar No. 101336 AMANDA DODDS 4 Senior Legal Analyst 110 West "A" Street, Suite 1100 San Diego, CA 92101 5 P.O. Box 85266 6 San Diego, CA 92186-5266 Telephone: (619) 645-2141 7 Facsimile: (619) 645-2061 Attorneys for Complainant

BEFORE THE BOARD OF VOCATIONAL NURSING AND PSYCHIATRIC TECHNICIANS DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

Case No. VN-2008-259

JASON GEORGE STRYKER 222 J Street, Apt. 319

ACCUSATION

San Diego, CA 92102

Vocational Nurse License No. VN 228255

Respondent.

17

18

16

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

Complainant alleges:

19

20

21

24

25

1. Teresa Bello-Jones, J.D., M.S.N., R.N. (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in

PARTIES

her official capacity as the Executive Officer of the Board of Vocational Nursing and Psychiatric

22 Technicians, Department of Consumer Affairs.

23 2. On or about June 22, 2007, the Board of Vocational Nursing and Psychiatric

Technicians issued Vocational Nurse License Number VN 228255 to Jason George Stryker

(Respondent). The Vocational Nurse License was in full force and effect at all times relevant to

26 the charges brought herein and will expire on December 31, 2012, unless renewed.

27 1///

28 ///

1

JURISDICTION

- 3. This Accusation is brought before the Board of Vocational Nursing and Psychiatric Technicians (Board), Department of Consumer Affairs, under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code (Code) unless otherwise indicated.
- 4. Section 2875 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the Board may discipline the holder of a vocational nurse license for any reason provided in Article 3 (commencing with section 2875) of the Vocational Nursing Practice Act.
- 5. Section 118, subdivision (b) of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the expiration of a license shall not deprive the Board jurisdiction to proceed with a disciplinary action during the period within which the license may be renewed, restored, reissued or reinstated. Under section 2892.1 of the Code, the Board may renew an expired license at any time within four years after the expiration.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

6. Section 482 of the Code states:

Each board under the provisions of this code shall develop criteria to evaluate the rehabilitation of a person when:

- (a) Considering the denial of a license by the board under Section 480; or
- (b) Considering suspension or revocation of a license under Section 490.

Each board shall take into account all competent evidence of rehabilitation furnished by the applicant or licensee.

- 7. Section 490 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the Board may suspend or revoke a license when it finds that the licensee has been convicted of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a licensed vocational nurse.
 - 8. Section 493 of the Code states:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in a proceeding conducted by a board within the department pursuant to law to deny an application for a license or to suspend or revoke a license or otherwise take disciplinary action against a person who holds a license, upon the ground that the applicant or the licensee has been convicted of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of the licensee in question, the record of conviction of the crime shall be conclusive evidence of the fact that the conviction occurred, but only of that fact, and the board

abuse. A violation of this section constitutes unprofessional conduct for purposes of initiating disciplinary action.

12. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 2521, states:

For the purposes of denial, suspension, or revocation of a license pursuant to Division 1.5 (commencing with Section 475) of the Business and Professions Code, a crime or act shall be considered to be substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a licensed vocational nurse if to a substantial degree it evidences present or potential unfitness of a licensed vocational nurse to perform the functions authorized by his license in a manner consistent with the public health, safety, or welfare. Such crimes or acts shall include but not be limited to those involving the following:

- (a) Procuring a license by fraud, misrepresentation, or mistake.
- (b) A conviction of practicing medicine without a license in violation of Chapter 5 of Division 2 of the Business and Professions Code.
- (c) Violating or attempting to violate, directly or indirectly, or assisting in or abetting the violation of, or conspiring to violate any provision or term of Chapter 6.5, Division 2 of the Business and Professions Code.
- (d) Aiding or assisting, or agreeing to aid or assist any person or persons, whether a licensed physician or not, in the performance of or arranging for a violation of any of the provisions of Article 13, Chapter 5, Division 2 of the Business and Professions Code.
 - (e) Conviction of a crime involving fiscal dishonesty.
- (f) Any crime or act involving the sale, gift, administration, or furnishing of "narcotics or dangerous drugs or dangerous devices" as defined in Section 4022 of the Business and Professions Code.

13. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 2522 states:

When considering a) the denial of a license under Section 480 of the Business and Professions Code, b) the suspension or revocation of a license on the ground that a licensee has been convicted of a crime, or c) a petition for reinstatement of a license under Section 2787.7 of the Business and Professions Code, the Board in evaluating the rehabilitation of an individual and his or her present eligibility for a license, will consider the following criteria:

- (1) Nature and severity of the act(s), offense(s), or crime(s) under consideration.
- (2) Actual or potential harm to the public.
- (3) Actual or potential harm to any patient.
- (4) Overall disciplinary record.
- (5) Overall criminal actions taken by any federal, state or local agency or court.

The court also found true that Respondent's BAC was 0.15 percent or more, within the meaning of Vehicle Code section 23578. The court dismissed additional counts of driving under the influence of alcohol (Veh. Code, § 23152(a)), and driving without a valid driver's license (Veh. Code, § 12500(a)), pursuant to a plea agreement.

- b. As a result of the conviction, on or about May 20, 2009, Respondent was sentenced to 120 days in the custody of the sheriff, with credit for two days, to be served in the Short Term Work Furlough program. Respondent was granted five years summary probation, and he was ordered to enroll in and complete a Multiple Conviction Program, pay fines, fees, and restitution in the amount of \$2,408, and comply with the terms of standard DUI probation.
- c. The facts that led to the conviction are that on or about the early morning of July 13, 2008, a California Highway Patrol (CHP) officer arrived at a U.S. Border Patrol checkpoint to evaluate a possible DUI driver stopped by the Border Patrol. It was reported to the CHP officer that while Respondent was stopped at the checkpoint, a strong odor of an alcoholic beverage emitted from within the vehicle, and that there was an open can of beer in the center console. Respondent had fallen asleep in the back of a Border Patrol vehicle and had to be woken by the CHP officer. Respondent stumbled as he got out of the patrol car, and was unsteady on his feet. The officer could smell the distinct odor of an alcoholic beverage on Respondent's breath, his eyes were red and glassy, and his speech was slurred. Respondent admitted to consuming alcohol before and during driving, and also admitted he had smoked marijuana before he left his house. Respondent did not have a California driver's license. Respondent provided two breath samples which were analyzed by the preliminary alcohol screening device with a BAC of .145 and .149 percent, respectively. Respondent was unable to complete the field sobriety tests as explained and demonstrated by the officer, and he was arrested for DUI. In a search of Respondent's vehicle, the officer found three open cans of beer, two mini liquor bottles, and a small tobacco pipe containing marijuana residue.

26 | /// 27 | ///

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

28 ///

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Use of Alcohol & Controlled Substances in a Dangerous Manner)

16. Respondent has subjected his license to disciplinary action under section 2878.5, subdivision (b) of the Code for unprofessional conduct in that on or about July 13, 2008, he used alcohol and marijuana, and under their combined influence, drove a vehicle as described in paragraph 15, above. Such conduct was dangerous or injurious to himself and others.

THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Alcohol-Related Criminal Conviction)

17. Respondent has subjected his license to disciplinary action under section 2878.5 subdivision (c) of the Code for unprofessional conduct in that on or about May 20, 2009, he pled guilty to and was convicted of violating Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (b), driving with a BAC of 0.08 percent or higher, as described in paragraph 15, above.

FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Failure to Abstain From Substance Abuse)

18. Respondent has subjected his license to disciplinary action under section 2878, subdivision (a) of the Code, and California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 2518.6 in that Respondent has failed to abstain from abusing illegal controlled substances, as described in paragraphs 15, 19, and 20.

DISCIPLINARY CONSIDERATIONS

- 19. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on Respondent, pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 2522, Complainant alleges that on or about March 19, 2002, in a criminal proceeding entitled *State of Missouri v. Jason G. Stryker*, in the 12th Judicial Circuit Court, case number CR0601-001645M, Respondent was convicted on his plea of guilty of driving while intoxicated on April 20, 2001.
- 20. Complainant further alleges that on or about March 26, 2004, in a criminal proceeding entitled *Commonwealth of Pennsylvania v. Jason George Stryker*, in Huntingdon County Court of Common Pleas, case number 03-572 CA, Respondent was convicted on his plea of guilty of driving under the influence on September 27, 2003.